



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,311	10/31/2003	Yoshinori Shizuno	OHG 143	9864
23995 7590 03/19/2007 RABIN & Berdo, PC 1101 14TH STREET, NW SUITE 500 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER LEE, EUGENE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2815	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/19/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/697,311

Applicant(s)

SHIZUNO, YOSHINORI

Examiner

Eugene Lee

Art Unit

2815

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3, 5, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamigawa et al. JPO 2000208556 A in view of Hirano et al. 6,472,749 B1. Nakamigawa discloses (see, for example, figure 3) a semiconductor device comprising a semiconductor chip 1, plurality of chip electrodes (plurality of electrode pads) 10, resin (extension portion) 9, adhesives (insulating film) 4, wirings (plurality of wiring patterns) 5, substrate (sealing portion) 2, and plurality of solder balls (plurality of external terminals) 12. Nakamigawa does not disclose the electrode pads being arranged in a first line extending in a first direction along a peripheral edge of the semiconductor chip on the first main surface, and the external terminals being arranged in a second line extending in a second direction perpendicular to said first direction, and being electrically connected to the electrode pads in a one-on-one connection relationship. However, Hirano discloses (see, for example, FIG. 14) a semiconductor device comprising a semiconductor chip 7B, electrodes (electrode pads) 8, and bumps lands (external terminals) 4. The electrodes extend vertically on the peripheral edge of the semiconductor chip 7B, and connect to the bump lands, which extend horizontally, in a one-on-one relationship. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the electrode pads being arranged in a first line extending in a first direction along a peripheral edge of the

Art Unit: 2815

semiconductor chip on the first main surface, and the external terminals being arranged in a second line extending in a second direction perpendicular to said first direction, and being electrically connected to the electrode pads in a one-on-one connection relationship in order to connect the chip externally in a manner which maximizes the area of a semiconductor device.

Regarding claim 3, see, for example, figure 3 wherein Nakamigawa discloses vertical regions (electrode posts) in between the solder ball 12 and the pad 13.

Regarding claims 5, and 6, it has been held that a recitation (i.e. formed as solders balls, lands) with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex Parte Masham*, 2 USPQ F. 2d 1647 (1987).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamigawa et al. JP 2000208556 A in view of Hirano et al. '749 B1 as applied to claims 1, 3, 5, and 6 above, and further in view of Jackson et al. 6,800,930 B2. Nakamigawa in view of Hirano does not disclose a thin oxidation layer formed on a side surface of said electrode posts. However, Jackson discloses (see, for example, Fig. 3) a semiconductor device comprising vias 124, conductive material 130, and dielectric layer (thin oxidation layer) 128. In column 6, lines 55-62, Jackson

Art Unit: 2815

discloses the dielectric layer being silicon dioxide. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have a thin oxidation layer formed on a side surface of said electrode posts in order to prevent diffusion of the vertical regions into other regions of the semiconductor device.

5. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamigawa et al. JP 2000208556 A in view of Hirano et al. '749 B1 as applied to claims 1, 3, 5, and 6 above, and further in view of Torres et al. 5,898,213. Nakamigawa in view of Hirano does not disclose a portion of said wiring patterns on a boundary and a vicinity of a boundary between a region on the upper side of said semiconductor chip and said extension portion being formed wider or more thickly than other portions of said wiring patterns. However, Torres discloses (see, for example, FIG. 3) a semiconductor device comprising bonding posts 36 that are wider along a boundary A, and B. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have a portion of said wiring patterns on a boundary and a vicinity of a boundary between a region on the upper side of said semiconductor chip and said extension portion being formed wider or more thickly than other portions of said wiring patterns in order to form a staggered configuration that permits substantially more connections in the limited amount of space of the semiconductor device.

6. Claims 8, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamigawa et al. JP 2000208556 A in view of Hirano et al. '749 B1 as applied to claims 1, 3, 5, and 6 above, and further in view of Ma et al. 6,271,469 B1. Nakamigawa in view of Hirano

Art Unit: 2815

does not disclose said extension portion being formed from a material having a greater molding shrinkage than the molding shrinkage of said sealing portion. However, Ma discloses (see, for example, FIG. 1K) a package comprising an encapsulating material (extension portion) 112, and first dielectric layer (sealing portion) 118. In column 3, lines 54-63, and column 4, lines 6-12, Ma discloses the encapsulating material comprising plastics, resins, and the first dielectric layer comprising silicon dioxide, silicon nitride. Plastics, resins have a greater molding shrinkage than silicon oxide, silicon nitride. Ma further discloses the encapsulation provides mechanical rigidity, protects the die from contaminants, and provides surface area for the build-up of trace layers. The first dielectric layer provides an adequate material so that vias may be formed thereon. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have said extension portion being formed from a material having a greater molding shrinkage than the molding shrinkage of said sealing portion in order to have an extension portion that has mechanical rigidity, protects the die from contaminants, and provides surface area for the build-up of trace layers, and a sealing portion made of a material that can support the wirings.

Regarding claim 9, Nakamigawa in view of Hirano in view of Ma does not disclose said extension portion having a linear expansion coefficient in a lower temperature range than glass transition temperature of less than $1.5 \times 10^{-5}/^{\circ}\text{C}$. and a modulus of elasticity within a range of 7.8 to 22 GPa. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to use a material having a linear expansion coefficient in a lower temperature range than glass transition temperature of less than $1.5 \times 10^{-5}/^{\circ}\text{C}$. and a modulus of elasticity within a range of 7.8 to 22 GPa in order to have a

Art Unit: 2815

material that has adequate mechanical rigidity, provides protection for the semiconductor chip, and provides surface area for the build-up of trace layers.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, and 3-9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

INFORMATION ON HOW TO CONTACT THE USPTO

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eugene Lee whose telephone number is 571-272-1733. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kenneth Parker can be reached on 571-272-2298. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/697,311

Page 7

Art Unit: 2815

Eugene Lee
March 12, 2007

EUGENE LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Eugene Lee', written in a cursive style.